



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,981	09/26/2001	Gero Bacse	112740-300	3320

29177 7590 12/11/2006

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
P. O. BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER

VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2623

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment filed 10/16/2006. Claims **1-14** are pending. Claims **1-3, 7-11** are amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
2. Claims **1-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Referring to claims **1, 10, and 11**, the amended claim recites a “mobile telephone;” however, the examiner fails to find a recitation of “telephone” in the applicant’s specification. As such, the examiner fails to find support for the “telephone” of claim 1.

Claims **2-9** are rejected as being dependent on claim 1.

Claims **12-14** are rejected as being dependent on claim 11.

Further referring to claim **2**, the amended claim recites a “step of coordinating video recording of the television program with the reception of the radio transmitted data.” In support

Art Unit: 2623

of the amended matter, the applicant cites p. 1, l. 21-24 of applicant's specification. The examiner notes that this recitation of video recording is located in the Background of the Invention portion of the specification. The passage states "Television users have recorded relevant programs on video. But, video recording of television programs involves the disadvantage that there is a time delay between the time of the broadcast or transmission and the time the video recorded program is seen. Such time delays are often unacceptable to the users, particularly for sporting events." Prior to the quoted passage, it states "For regular television uses, it is highly important not to miss regularly watched programs." The examiner interprets the background portion of the specification as reciting why it would be desirable to use a portable device for receiving television program information immediately rather than a device in which there is a delay between when the program is aired and when the user is able to enjoy it. Thus, the examiner concludes that this portion of the specification does not describe the applicant's invention, but prior attempts to solve a similar problem. As such, the examiner fails to find support for the amended matter of claim 2.

Still further referring to claim 2, the examiner fails to find mention of "coordinating" video recording with the reception of radio transmitted data in the applicant's specification. As such, the examiner fails to find support for the amended matter of claim 2, as claimed.

Further referring to claim 3, the amended claim recites that the transmitting step comprises transmitting "the data via short message service (SMS)." The examiner notes that the claim is dependent on claim 1, which states that the data represents contents of a television program "that is being concurrently broadcast." In support of the amended matter, the applicant cites p. 6, l. 14-16 of applicant's specification, which states "a reminder of the start of a program

can be provided, for example, by means of a short message (SMS).” The examiner notes that the specification fails to disclose that the SMS message is transmitted while a related television program is “concurrently broadcast,” as claimed. The SMS message could be a reminder sent prior to broadcast of the television program, for instance. The examiner also notes that the specification fails to disclose that the SMS message represent textual contents of the related program. An SMS reminder of the start of a program need not necessarily represent textual contents of the related program. As such, the examiner fails to find support for the amended matter of claim 3, as currently claimed.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Referring to claim 8, the examiner recommends that the phrase “the a user” be changed to “a user.” The examiner addresses the claim in the Office Action below as though the recommended changes have been made.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sharma.

Referring to claims 1 and 9, Sharma discloses a method of transmitting data which represents contents of a related television program that is being concurrently broadcast comprising the steps of radio transmitting the data which represents textual contents of the related television program from a transmitter to a mobile telephone (the examiner notes that teletext messages are decoded from television signals and transmitted to mobile stations 112. Telephonic communication is effectuated between the mobile station and the WAP server 102. A user can refresh a teletext page containing the latest score of a soccer match, thereby transmitting data which represents contents of a related television program that is being concurrently broadcast, as claimed)(col. 3, l. 64-67; col. 4, l. 1-36, 48-54; col. 5, l. 14-53; col. 7, l. 26-28; & Fig. 1).

Referring to claim 5, Sharma discloses a method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the step of storing pre-selected television program information in memory (col. 5, l. 63-67 & col. 6, l. 1-5), and wherein the transmitting step further comprises transmitting the stored pre-selected television program information (col. 4, l. 17-36).

Referring to claim 6, Sharma discloses a method as claimed in claim 5, wherein the transmitting step further comprises transmitting the stored pre-selected television program information by one of automatically, according to a predetermined schedule, on request, and combinations thereof (col. 4, l. 17-36; col. 5, l. 20-23; & col. 7, l. 24-35).

NOTE: The USPTO considers the applicant's "one of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements.

Referring to claim 7, Sharma discloses a method as claimed in claim 1, further comprising the step of matching a form of the data to display options of the mobile telephone (col. 5, l. 30-53; col. 6, l. 9-16).

Referring to claim 11, Sharma discloses an apparatus for transmitting data, which at least partially represents contents of a television program to a mobile telephone, comprising:

- a device having a television program (col. 5, l. 63);
- a device having data, which at least partially represents textual contents of the television program (col. 5, l. 63-67 & col. 6, l. 1-5); and
- a transmitter connected to the device having the television program and the device having data, which at least represents contents of the television program, the transmitter transmitting the data via a mobile radio network to the mobile telephone concurrently with a broadcast of the television program (col. 4, l. 17-36, 48-54 & col. 6, l. 6-23).

Referring to claim 12, Sharma discloses an apparatus according to claim 11, wherein the device having a television program further comprises one of a device having a live television program (the examiner notes that it is inherent for the WAP server to have a live television program in order to provide the latest score of a soccer match)(col. 7, l. 23-28), a memory, which stores a recorded television program, and combinations thereof.

NOTE: The USPTO considers the applicant's "one of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements.

Referring to claims 13 and 14, Sharma discloses an apparatus according to claims 11 and 12, respectively, wherein the device having data, which at least partially represents contents of

Art Unit: 2623

the television program, further comprises one of a device having on-line generated data (col. 7, l. 24-35), a memory, which stores the data (col. 5, l. 63-67 & col. 6, l. 1-5), and combinations thereof.

NOTE: The USPTO considers the applicant's "one of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marshall et al.

Referring to claim 10, Marshall et al. discloses an apparatus for transmitting data, which at least partially represents contents of a television program to a mobile telephone, comprising:

- a television program memory device capable of storing the television program (the examiner notes that the transaction processing and subscription management system 24 can record racing videos)(col. 13, l. 32-57);
- a data memory device having the data, which at least partially represents textual contents of the television program (col. 7, l. 2-5; col. 14, l. 51-67; & col. 15, l. 1-10); and
- a transmitter device connected to the television program memory device and the data memory device, the transmitter device transmitting the data via a mobile radio network to the mobile telephone concurrently with broadcast of the television program (col. 13, l. 35-36; col. 14, l. 51-67; & col. 15, l. 1-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Wegener et al.

Referring to claims 2 and 4, Sharma discloses the method as claimed in claim 1. Sharma does not disclose a step of coordinating video recording of the television program with the reception of the radio transmitted data or transmitting video data which represents contents of the television program. Wegener et al. discloses transmitting video content to a cellular telephone and storing the video content in the cellular telephone's memory (col. 3, l. 46-48; col. 5, l. 14-60; & Fig. 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Sharma to include transmitting and storing video content on a cellular phone, such as that taught by Wegener et al. in order to quickly provide a user with additional multimedia content.

3. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Wegener et al. and further in view of Sladek et al.

Referring to claim 3, the combination of Sharma and Wegener et al. teaches the method as claimed in claim 2. The combination of Sharma and Wegener et al. does not teach that the transmitting step further comprises transmitting the data via short message service (SMS). Sladek et al. discloses sending an SMS message indicating a television station that is being

Art Unit: 2623

watched to a cellular phone (col. 4, l. 4-6; col. 5, l. 46-50; & col. 16, l. 14-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the combination of Sharma and Wegener et al. to include sending an SMS message indicating a television station that is being watched to the cellular telephone, such as that taught by Sladek et al. in order to provide a user with useful informational updates.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma in view of Youngs et al.

Referring to claim 8, Sharma discloses a method as claimed in claim 1. Sharma further discloses a mobile switching center (MSC)(col. 4, l. 42-54). Sharma does not disclose a step of automatically billing costs for the transmission via a telephone bill for the user of the mobile telephone. Youngs et al. discloses a Mobile Switching Center (MSC) 22, which compiles mobile billing information (col. 2, l. 27-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the MSC of Sharma to compile mobile billing information, such as that taught by Youngs et al. in order to appropriately compensate network and content providers for the usage of their products/services.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Aarnio discloses a system and method of providing on-line subscription services from a subscription server to a user of a mobile terminal through the Internet.

Ritter discloses a telecommunications mobile device comprising a television receiver.

Schultz discloses receiving a request from a mobile subscriber unit and streaming data to the mobile subscriber unit.

Bhatia discloses a method and apparatus for enabling a user to request location information from a mobile station telephone unit.

Stocker et al. discloses a method and system for sending general information messages to users in a mobile radio network.

Bhatia discloses a system, method and apparatus for polling telecommunications nodes for real-time information.

Tajima discloses an FM teletext receiving device with a detachable storage medium.

Michael et al. discloses a method and apparatus for providing voice/unified messaging services using CATV terminals.

Yukie et al. discloses a method, system and devices for wireless data storage on a server and data retrieval.

Du Val discloses sending a datacast within a television or radio signal to a user's cell phone.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2623

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Van Handel whose telephone number is 571-272-5968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:30pm Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571-272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2623

MVH


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600